UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,413	12/28/2001	Alan Ballard	PA2065US	3118

22830 7590 12/01/2005

CARR & FERRELL LLP
2200 GENG ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER	
PITARO, RYAN F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/035,413	BALLARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan F. Pitaro	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 September 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *4-31 and 35-73* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *4-31,35-73* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/28/2001*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to Amendment B 9/19/2005. Claims 4-31, and 35-73 are pending in the application. Claims 4-31, and 35-73 were amended. Claims 32-34 were cancelled. This action is non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 4-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warren ("Warren", US 6,934,697) in view of McCain ("McCain", US 5916310).

As per independent claim 4, Warren discloses a customizable application system comprising: an internet application system configured to support an internet application (Column 6 lines 4-13), the internet application associated with metadata configured for use in generating an application user interface including a user interface element (Column 6 lines 14-29), the internet application system including: a) a user interface generator configured to generate the application user interface using the metadata (Column 6 lines 22-29), and b) a web application server configured to deliver the application user interface to a client (Column 5 lines 31-65); and a data repository including a data record for storing the configuration data, the data record being

accessible using the metadata (Column 6 lines 22-29). Warren fails to distinctly point out a application development system and a configuration system for a keystroke combination. However, McCain teaches an application development system configured to generate the metadata, the metadata being further configured to characterize a user customizable immediate access keystroke combination associated with the user interface element (Column 6 lines 30-44) a configuration system including a configuration engine and a configuration interface, the configuration interface configured to modify configuration data further characterizing the customizable immediate access keystroke combination in response to receiving input from a user defining the customizable immediate access keystroke combination, the keystroke combination for a function to be performed for the user interface element (Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67) with data defining the elements function (Column 6 lines 30-44); wherein the application user interface is automatically generated and configured to perform for the user interface element when the immediate keystroke combination is received (Column 8 lines 56-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of McCain with the teaching of Warren. Motivation to do so would have been to enhance the functionality of an HTML document.

Claim 5 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 6 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 5, Warren-McCain teaches a system wherein the immediate access keystroke combination is responsive to the identity of a user (Warren, Column 12 lines 31-38).

Claim 8 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination is a hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination is configurable according to the identity of a user (Warren,, Column 12 lines 31-47).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 8, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the data record is user modifiable using a configuration system (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 8, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the data record is user modifiable using a personalization system (Warren, Column 12 lines 31-47).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Warren-McCain discloses a system, wherein the personalization system is integrated into the internet application (Warren, Column 12 lines 31-47).

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 14, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the client supports the application user interface using standard web browser protocols (Warren, Column 6 lines 4-13).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the client supports the application user interface using features of a web browser, the features not requiring a browser add-on, plug-in, or extension (Warren, Column 6 lines 4-13, McCain, Column 5 lines 65-67).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 14, Warren-McCain discloses a system further including a personalization system configured to modify the user modifiable data record (Warren, Column 12 lines 31-47).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the personalization system is included in the internet application (Warren, Column 12 lines 31-47).

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20,which is dependent on claim 19, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the user interface generator is further configured to use metadata to characterize the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 21,which is dependent on claim 19, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination is a hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 22,which is dependent on claim 19, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the user interface generator is further configured to use a user modifiable data record to characterize the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 23,which is dependent on claim 19, Warren-McCain discloses a system further including means for accessing a user-modifiable data record including data characterizing the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 24,which is dependent on claim 19, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the internet application includes a configuration system configured to modify data characterizing the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 25,which is dependent on claim 19, Warren-McCain fails to disclose a system wherein the client is a wireless system. However, Official Notice is taken that wireless systems are well known in the art as a suitable communication means. Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of Warren-McCain with the current teaching. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a way of communicating with the network so that the client is more mobile.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 19, Warren-McCain discloses a system wherein the client is a programmable device configured to support standard web browser protocols (Warren, Column 6 lines 4-13, McCain, Column 5 lines 65-67).

Claim 27 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 27, Warren-McCain discloses an application, wherein the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination is a hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 28, Warren-McCain discloses an application, wherein the user modifiable data record is further configurable such that generation of the application user interface is responsive to an identity of the client (Warren, Column 10 lines 10-14).

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 27, Warren-McCain discloses an application, wherein the user modifiable data record is configurable using a configuration interface (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 27, Warren-McCain discloses a an application, wherein the user modifiable data record is further configurable such that generation of the application user interface is responsive to an identity of the user (Warren, Column 12 lines 34-38).

Claim 35 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 35, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination is a hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67)).

As per claim 37, which is dependent on claim 36, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the step of specifying a customizable property is performed using an integrated development environment (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67)).

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 36, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the internet application includes a configuration system configured to modify the data record (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

Claim 39 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 39, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the customizable application user interface is a user interface to an internet application (Warren, Column 6 lines 4-29).

As per claim 41, which is dependent on claim 40, Warren-McCain discloses a method, further including a step of modifying the data record using a configuration system (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 42, which is dependent on claim 40, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the step of accessing a data record using the metadata is responsive to the identity of a user (Warren, Column 12 lines 34-38).

As per claim 43, which is dependent on claim 40, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination is a hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

Claim 44 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 45, which is dependent on claim 44, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the application is an internet application (Warren, Column 6 lines 4-29).

As per claim 46, which is dependent on claim 45, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the metadata is configured to access the data record responsive to an identity of a user of the application (Warren, Column 12 lines 34-38).

As per claim 47, which is dependent on claim 45, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the customizable immediate access keystroke combination is a hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

Claim 48 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 49, which is dependent on claim 48, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the immediate access keystroke combination is a hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 50, which is dependent on claim 48, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein configuration data is configured to characterize the immediate access keystroke combination responsive to an identity of a user of the internet application (Warren, Column 12 lines 34-38).

As per claim 51, which is dependent on claim 48, Warren-McCain discloses a method, further including a step of modifying the configuration data using a personalization system (Warren, Column 12 lines 34-38).

As per claim 52, which is dependent on claim 48, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the HTML based application user interface is displayed at the client without requiring a browser add-on, plug-in, or extension (Warren, Column 6 lines 4-13, McCain, Column 5 lines 65-67).

Claim 53 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 54, which is dependent on claim 53, Warren-McCain discloses a method, further including a step of displaying the application user interface using standard web browser protocols (Warren, Column 6 lines 4-13, McCain, Column 5 lines 65-67).

As per claim 55, which is dependent on claim 53, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the immediate access keystroke combination is a hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

Claim 56 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 57, which is dependent on claim 56, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination is a hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 58, which is dependent on claim 56, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the retrieved value is personalization data (Warren, Column 12 lines 34-38).

As per claim 59, which is dependent on claim 56, Warren-McCain discloses a method, further including a step of displaying the application user interface on the client using standard web browser protocols (Warren, Column 6 lines 4-13, McCain, Column 5 lines 65-67).

As per claim 60, which is dependent on claim 56, Warren-McCain discloses a method, further including the step of identifying the requestor, wherein the step of retrieving a value is responsive to the identity of the requester (Warren, Column 12 lines 34-38).

As per claim 61, which is dependent on claim 56, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the step of retrieving a value is responsive to inclusion of the application user interface in an application component (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

Claim 62 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 63, which is dependent on claim 62, Anuff-Forms discloses a method, wherein the user customizable immediate access keystroke combination is a hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 64, which is dependent on claim 62, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the data record includes personalization data (Warren, Column 12 lines 34-38).

As per claim 65, which is dependent on claim 62, Warren-McCain discloses a method, further comprising: delivering the application user interface to the client

(Warren, Column 5 lines 31-65); and displaying the application user interface at the client using standard web browser protocols (Warren, Column 6 lines 4-13, McCain, Column 5 lines 65-67).

As per claim 66, which is dependent on claim 62, Warren-McCain discloses a method, further including identifying the client, wherein the step of reading data is responsive to the identity of the client (Warren, Column 10 lines 10-14).

As per claim 67, which is dependent on claim 62, Warren-McCain discloses a method, further including a step of identifying a user, wherein the step of reading data is responsive to the identity of the user (Warren, Column 12 lines 34-38).

Claim 68 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 69, which is dependent on claim 68, Warren-McCain discloses a method, wherein the customizable immediate access keystroke combination is a customizable hotkey keystroke combination (McCain, Column 6 lines 30-44,63-67).

As per claim 70, which is dependent on claim 68, Warren-McCain discloses a method, further including displaying the user customizable application user interface using standard web browser protocols (Warren, Column 6 lines 4-13, McCain, Column 5 lines 65-67).

Claims 71-73 are individually similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-31,35-73 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday, and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100